

Remarks

Claims 1-7, 10-12, 15, 17-23, 26-28, 31 and 47-48 are pending. Claims 8-9, 13-14, 16, 24-25, 29-30 and 32-46 are cancelled and new Claims 47-48 are added in this Response.

All pending claims (except new Claims 47-48) stand rejected as being anticipated by or obvious over Peng (6,317,754) or obvious over Peng in view of Guturu (6,581,075).

Claim 1 has been amended to recite identifying the pushed record in the remote application data store as a pushed record. Neither Peng nor Guturu teach or suggest pushing a record from one data store to a second data store under the conditions recited in amended Claim 1 and then identifying the pushed record in the second data as a pushed record. Claim 1 as amended, therefore, is felt to distinguish patentably over the cited references.

Claims 2-4 are also felt to distinguish patentably over Peng and Guturu due to their dependence on Claim 1.

Claim 5 has been amended to recite ascertaining whether the identified record has been pushed into the local application data store from a remote application data store. Neither Peng nor Guturu teach or suggest ascertaining whether a data record has been pushed into one data store from another data store under the conditions recited in amended Claim 5. Claim 5 as amended, therefore, is felt to distinguish patentably over the cited references.

Claims 6-7 are also felt to distinguish patentably over Peng and Guturu due to their dependence on Claim 5.

Further with regard to Claim 6 as amended, there is nothing in the cited references that teaches or suggests examining an indicator associated with a pushed record identifying the pushed record as a pushed record, as a means for ascertaining whether the data record has been pushed into the one data store from another data store. For this additional reason, Claim 6 distinguishes over Peng and Guturu.

Claim 10 has been amended to recite:

detecting changes to a local application data store;

Identifying a first record in the local application data store affected by a detected change;

pushing the first record to a remote application data store;
ascertaining whether the pushed record, in its current form as affected by the detected change, has been replicated in or deleted the remote application data store and, if not, updating the remote application data store with the pushed record;
detecting changes to the remote application data store;
identifying a second record in the remote application data store affected by a detected change;
ascertaining whether the second record, in its current form as affected by the detected change, has been pushed into the remote application data store and, if not, synchronizing the remote application data store with the local application data store.

Neither Peng nor Guturu teach or suggest ascertaining whether a data record has been pushed into one data store from another data store under the conditions recited in amended Claim 10. Claim 10 as amended, therefore, is felt to distinguish patentably over the cited references.

Claims 11-12 and 15 are also felt to distinguish patentably over Peng and Guturu due to their dependence on Claim 10.

Further with regard to Claim 12 as amended, there is nothing in the cited references that teach or suggest ascertaining whether the pushed record has been replicated in or deleted from the remote application data store by examining an indicator associated with the pushed record identifying the pushed record in the remote application data store as a pushed record. For this additional reason, amended Claim 12 distinguishes over Peng and Guturu.


Further with regard to Claim 15 as amended, there is nothing in the cited references that teach or suggest identifying the pushed record in the remote application data store as a pushed record. For this additional reason, amended Claim 15 distinguishes patentably over Peng and Guturu.

Claims 17-23, 26-28 and 31 are computer medium counterparts to the methods recited in Claims 1-7, 10-12 and 15. For the reasons noted above, Claims 17-23, 26-28 and 31 also distinguished patentably over Peng and Guturu.

All pending claims are now felt to be in condition for allowance. The foregoing is believed to be a complete response to the outstanding office action.

Respectfully submitted,
Richard Detweiler, et al

By



Steven R. Ormiston
Reg. No. 35,974

May 26, 2004